



Town Meeting



Bulletin OF AMERICA'S
TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR
Sponsored by THE READER'S DIGEST

Does the Atomic Bomb Make World Government Essential Now?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

RAYMOND SWING
CORD MEYER

REAGAN "TEX" McCRARY
GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT

(See also page 12)

COMING DECEMBER 13th

Can We Have Higher Wages Without Higher Prices?

(PREVIEW IN THIS ISSUE—SEE PAGE 23)

TUNE IN EVERY THURSDAY, AMERICAN BROADCASTING COMPANY—8:30 p.m., E.S.T.





CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF NOVEMBER 29:

"Does the Atomic Bomb Make World Government Essential Now?"

<i>Mr. DENNY</i>	3
<i>Mr. SWING</i>	4
<i>Major ELIOT</i>	6
<i>Lieutenant MEYER</i>	8
<i>Colonel MCCRARY</i>	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN.....	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!.....	15



THE BROADCAST OF DECEMBER 6:

"Do We Need Universal Military Training Now?"

(SEE PREVIEW IN BULLETIN OF NOVEMBER 22)



THE BROADCAST OF DECEMBER 13:

"Can We Have Higher Wages Without Higher Prices?"

TOWN MEETING PREVIEW.....	23
---------------------------	----

The Broadcast of November 29, 1945, originated in New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., E.S.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published weekly by *The Reader's Digest*, Town Meeting Publication Office: 32 South Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send subscriptions to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1897.



Town Meeting

Bulletin of America's Town Meeting of the Air



George V. Denny, Jr., Moderator

Does the Atomic Bomb Make World Government Essential Now?

Announcer:

The Reader's Digest, America's favorite magazine, welcomes you to another stirring session of America's Town Meeting, the program that gives both sides of issues affecting your life and mine. Tonight here at Town Hall, New York, four authorities clash over whether we must sacrifice a portion of our national sovereignty to avoid the horrors of an atomic bomb war. Now, to open this important session, *The Reader's Digest* brings you the president of Town Hall, founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. This is our third program on the atomic bomb, and it poses a question the whole world is asking: "Does the Atomic Bomb Make World Government Essential Now?" There appears to be little disagreement anywhere nowadays as to the de-

sirability of a world organization. But authorities differ greatly on the question as to whether that organization should be weak or strong, whether it should include all nations or not, and whether or not it should take the form of world government. And if so, what should be the nature of that government?

Let's begin first with a definition of world government so far as tonight's discussion is concerned. By world government we mean a world authority with definitely prescribed powers created by the people of all—or nearly all—of the nations of the world through their authorized representatives.

Within the limits of its prescribed powers, it may make laws and regulations. Such a world government would maintain an independent world police force and a world court, which would be the final authority with respect to those areas to which such a world

government is confined. The precise nature of a world government is not within the scope of our discussion this evening. We're concerned only with the principle as to whether or not the atomic bomb and all that it implies makes world government essential now. And by now we mean within the period of the next two or three years.

We have as our speakers two famous commentators and journalists, one of them a military analyst, and two young men who are veterans of this war, a Lieutenant in the Marine Corps and the other a Lieutenant Colonel in the Air Force. Raymond Swing and Major George Fielding Eliot take opposite sides on tonight's question, as do Lieutenant Cord Meyer, veteran of the Marines, and Lieutenant Colonel Reagan — better known as "Tex"—McCrary, veteran of the Air Forces. We hear first a voice familiar to all American Broadcasting Company listeners, the chairman of the Council of Democracy, Raymond Swing. Mr. Swing. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Swing:

The question we're discussing is so clearly worded, we have no excuse to shirk a single idea in it. "Does the Atomic Bomb Make World Government Essential Now?" To answer that it does, Mr. Meyer and I must show that the menace of the atomic bomb is so great as to make the continuance of the freedom of sovereign nations to wage war insanely dangerous. We must show that the danger is not in the bomb

alone but in the survival of unlimited national sovereignties, since war is the insistant expression of national sovereignty. And finally, we must demonstrate that world government—the subordination of these national sovereignties—is the effective way to establish peace.

I doubt that either Major Eliot or Colonel McCrary will argue that it is good that nations should remain free to express their sovereign wills by war. Once that might have been a grim but arguable doctrine. The atomic bomb has made it ludicrous. In a short time, every industrial nation that wishes to can have the bomb, and any war by a sovereign nation would be a war that may be over in a few minutes—leaving behind it universal ruin. No sovereignty will remain, nor will much else.

Scientists who made the bomb assure us that there can be thousands of them ready for use in another world war. These scientists assure us that there is no defense against the bomb itself and no assured method to prevent the bomb being brought to its target in one way or another. The atomic bomb has taken the contest out of war and replaced it by general ruin. It has destroyed war as we are accustomed to think of it.

Major Eliot and Colonel McCrary are either arguing for the sovereign right to be ruined, or they must deny the power of the atomic bomb, or they must disagree with us that world government is the answer. Obviously, they are not going to uphold the

right to ruin. If they deny the power of the bomb, they put themselves above the scientists who made it.

For the scientists—the men of fact who can't function scientifically if they yield for the littlest moment of prejudice and bigotry—all agree that the bomb widely used in atomic warfare will wipe out much of the human race and will obliterate what we call its civilization. So the real argument centers on whether world government is the answer. Mr. Meyer and I are not arguing that world government has only become desirable because of the atomic bomb. We contend that it would have been desirable without it. What we're arguing is that it has been made essential now by the atomic bomb.

Permit me a reference to myself. As a newspaperman, I have already reported two world wars. The first was the most destructive war that had ever been fought. The second was as much more destructive than the first as World War I was more destructive than the Franco-Prussian War. Another world war would carry the destruction to its final and complete fulfillment.

Yet it is possible before I die that I may have to stand by to report a third world war. We can be sure it will come unless we diagnose what causes wars and act to prevent them. For wars are not caused by weapons—not by any kind of weapons. Not by the atomic bomb. They are the deed of sovereign power in a world

without law. And the only way to prevent war is to establish a world of law which curbs the sovereign power of nations to attack other nations. (*Applause.*) A world of law is a world of government. A world of law was desirable and indeed urgently needed in view of the increasing destructiveness of the two wars of my time.

I say it is unanswerable that the atomic bomb has made it essential now. Let me add a final observation. Don't be misled by any argument that it is too early to achieve world government. True, the United Nations Organization is not a world government. It is an association of sovereign powers who have reserved their right to make war. But it is not true that it cannot be made the nucleus of world government.

After the Revolutionary War, we had a confederation of sovereign states, and the founding fathers made of it the United States. In the United Nations we have a confederation of sovereign nations. Our difficulty is not whether we can or cannot achieve the start of a world government; it is solely whether we can perceive and define what we need. Once we understand the problem, we can solve it. The truth is that world government alone can establish peace.

To object that it is difficult, or novel, or premature, is to be afraid of the truth. We urge you not to be afraid of the truth. But we urge you to be afraid of the atomic bomb as man has never

been afraid of anything in his entire history. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Raymond Swing. Our next speaker is also a familiar voice from this platform. A distinguished radio commentator, military analyst, and special writer for the *New York Herald Tribune*. I present Major George Fielding Eliot. Major Eliot. (*Applause.*)

Major Eliot:

Right at the beginning, I would like to disagree very definitely with the list of pre-digested contentment to which Mr. Swing has said that Colonel McCrary and I must be confined.

We are not, of course, arguing for what Mr. Swing calls the sovereign right to be ruined, nor are we denying that the atomic bomb is a threat to world security, nor do we deny that world government might provide an answer to the problem if it could be achieved and made workable right away. But we are convinced that effective world government in the present state of man is impossible. Therefore, it is not now the answer to anything.

The present problem of world security is in fact two problems. One is to prepare the way toward a better means of international co-operation than is now possible. The other is to survive in the meantime. Both these problems are essentially political in nature. The advice of physical scientists as to their solution is not necessarily any sounder than the advice of profes-

sors of botany. It is in political experience and not in physics that we must seek for our answers.

In organized communities, man has hitherto found peace and security within the community by means of government; that is, by law. In unorganized communities, he has sometimes found it temporarily by agreement among the peaceful majority of the citizens for co-operative action. The latter solution is imperfect, but it has frequently—as in our old West—enabled communities to survive serious perils until organized security under law became possible. These time-tested principles apply with just as much force to the problems of world community as they do to any of the lesser communities in which they have been tried and proved.

Now, let's consider the nature of government. Government implies the right to make laws, but it's essential to the idea of the law that it be attended by a penalty. Otherwise, what passes under the name of law would be, in fact, mere advice. There are two ways in which penalties for lawbreaking may be enforced—by the courts or by arms. The coercion of courts can be applied only to individuals. To coerce a lawbreaking, defiant nation—unless it's a very weak state—military force is required.

The idea of a world government which deals only with nation units is therefore basically defective. For every branch of the law would then imply a state of war, which is precisely what we're trying to avoid. This idea has been tried

often. It has invariably failed. The Leagues of Ancient Greece, the Holy Roman Empire, Holland before the French Revolution, the United States under the Articles of Confederation, all are tales of failure.

Therefore, when both Mr. Swing and Mr. Meyer say that we must have world government now, they must show that the overwhelming majority of human beings, including the populations of all the major powers, are now prepared to accept a world government which can deal directly with individuals, and those matters to which its powers may be confined; which can tax them; which can require them to participate in its defense, arrest, try, and punish them for violation of its laws.

But it should be obvious that the nations of this world are not now ready for any such drastic political changes or capable of making them work. Aside from purely structural difficulties, the essential foundation of such a world government must be a moral and psychological sense of world community, and that foundation does not presently exist. The minds and hearts of men are not prepared. That may come with time, but man must survive in the meanwhile. If he cannot now obtain security under world government, he must temporarily seek security by the only other means left to him—by agreement among existing governments.

The great virtue, it seems to me, of the United Nations Charter is

that those who drafted it faced this fact squarely. They saw that world government was not now obtainable, so they established machinery to facilitate agreement for subsequent common actions and common objectives based on agreement. They hoped that in working together within this organized framework, the advantages of such common solutions would become apparent to all men and that, in the course of these common labors and common accomplishments, a sense a world community, mutual confidence, and understanding might grow until at last the Parliament of Man might become reality.

And that hope, backed by substantial progress already made and supported by the acceptance of the Charter by 51 nations, still remains our best available means of seeking survival in a world which now, more than ever, no power has anything to gain by war.

It is not to be afraid of the truth to face the facts as they are. It is to be afraid of truth to insist that the facts are otherwise than as they are because we wish they might be otherwise. Those who framed the Charter of the United Nations indulged in no illusions, but have given us the means of temporary survival. And it is no service to the cause which they sought to serve to try to undermine confidence in the Charter by crying out that it is inadequate even before it has been tried. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Major Eliot. Well, it seems that those two commentators have "laid it on the line" on both sides—on both sides of the line. Now we want to know what two veterans of this war think about this question. The first was a Lieutenant in the Marines, Lieutenant Cord Meyer, and at San Francisco he served as aide to Captain Harold Stassen, one of our most distinguished delegates there. We present at this time Lieutenant Cord Meyer. (*Applause.*)

Lieutenant Meyer:

Mr. Swing has given you the facts. He has told you the unhappy truth that within five years or sooner our national security will have completely vanished, no matter what our strength in conscript armies or bigger bombs. Soon, if not today, this country will lie open to a surprise overnight attack that will see the death of forty million Americans and the total destruction of our cities. If Major Eliot or Colonel McCrary care to dispute these facts, our authority is the unanimous agreement of the scientists who made the bomb and know its possibilities. Let them dispute with Einstein, Oppenheimer, Urey and Compton. (*Applause.*)

But I think that not even our opposition tonight will deny the extreme necessity of avoiding the next war. Major Eliot also believes that the final goal is world government—or might be world government—but he contends that

right now it is both unnecessary and impossible. By world government, Mr. Swing and myself mean a world authority capable of exerting exclusive control over the major weapons of war.

Such control is only possible and can only be just if it is exerted through a system of laws and courts, binding not on government but on individuals. And this world law must be created by the democratic process in a world assembly representative of the people if it is not to be rank oppression. Also, the decisions of the courts must be backed by an adequate police force. Naturally, the powers of this federal government would be limited to the bare minimum necessary to the prevention of war.

Now, Major Eliot has told you that this world government is not necessary immediately. He holds out to you the hope that, through the UNO and the old diplomacy, we can gradually build between sovereign nations agreement and the sense of community. One look at the front page of the morning paper should convince you that he's wrong. From the Balkans to China, we see today each nation striving to find the will-of-the-wisp of a security that can never be achieved so long as other powerful nations exist.

Nowadays, when an attack is possible from any point on the globe, each defensive step of one nation must conflict with the corresponding security measures of other nations. We are caught today in a one-way street of in-

creasing tensions, a growing atomic armament race, and in the near future inevitable war.

As long as all countries must fear the imminent danger of atomic assault, we can expect no gradual improvement of relations between them, but only preparations for war, rising in tempo until nothing can prevent the catastrophe. Under these conditions, it is sentimental and wishful thinking to hope for a gradual improvement in mutual understanding. The only way we can get that is to take the first step first and not last.

We must first remove from the picture the threat of large-scale war, and the atomic bomb is not the source of that threat. The fact that Tennessee has the bomb does not frighten us here in New York, because there is sufficient governmental authority to which both states are subordinate, not only to prevent war, but to make it unnecessary. The bomb's threat to mankind lies in the existence of separate absolutely independent nations relying on armed force for survival. So long as this condition exists, so will wars. This is the evidence of 8,000 years of human history.

It is sufficient to add that the UNO, as it is today, does not change this basic condition of anarchy. Through their veto power and many other reservations in the Charter, the large nations retain their independence intact and all their power to make war.

Finally, Major Eliot pleaded that a world government is impossible

now because of the conflicting beliefs and prejudices between nations. In the first place, if Major Eliot is right, he is simply saying that we are doomed and that there is nothing that we can do about it. If world government cannot soon be achieved voluntarily, then neither can peace.

Secondly, if all men agreed and all conflict was resolved into a happy state of innocence, there would be no need for government. The very conflicts Mr. Eliot gloomily enumerates are the best argument in favor of government. For government is the only human institution within which conflicts can be peacefully resolved. Mr. Swing and I do not hope to eliminate strife and tension in the world. We simply propose to set limits to the form this conflict takes by placing a monopoly on the use of organized violence with a world government.

Let us be clear about one thing: the question is not whether we can or cannot achieve world government within the next few years, or whether it is necessary or not.

One way or another we shall certainly have world government within that time. Our only real choice is what kind of a government will it be and how will we get it. Will it be the dictatorship of the world by one nation through the destruction of all the rest, or will we arrive peacefully through voluntary and rational consent at a limited federal government in which all are fairly represented? More than with anyone else, the choice lies with us—the people of

the United States. When the majority of us know the facts, I am sure we will choose and choose rightly.

If there is one impression I should like to leave with you this evening, it is a sense of urgency. Particularly, I appeal to those young enough to hope and brave enough to act—to the soldiers from the war and those who must live in tomorrow's world. We have still a chance of making it a livable world, but the time is short. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Lt. Cord Meyer. Now, let's have another veteran's view. Before Reagan McCrary went to war in 1942, he was the editorial chief of the *New York Daily Mirror*. He has been nearly all over this world as the photographic officer of the 8th Air Force, and only took off his uniform about a month ago. It's a great pleasure to welcome you back to Town Hall—"Tex" McCrary. (*Applause.*)

Colonel McCrary:

It seems, Mr. Meyer, that we all agree on the ultimate strategy of preventing world war by world government. Our disagreement is on immediate tactics.

General Jimmy Doolittle summed up the Pacific war like this: The Navy had the ships and the supremacy to make the invasion of Japan possible; the Army had the men to make invasion successful; the B-29's and the atomic bomb made invasion unnecessary. That's

the way General Doolittle put it. I'd like to add this idea. The atomic bomb ended the war before the Allies were prepared for peace, and certainly before they were prepared for a super-sovereign world government that could end wars forever.

That doesn't mean that, with great care and clear purpose, we cannot nurse the world to the acceptance of real world government in, say, 15 years from now. And during that breathing time, I think we are pretty safe from another great war for several reasons. In the first place, there is only one nation able or liable to wage war against America within the next ten years, and that nation is Russia. In the second place, Russia knows that she cannot carry a war to America for 20 years, or at least she cannot without so fundamentally harnessing her entire energy for long-range war as to make the intention obvious. The atomic bomb is of no importance in a realistic appraisal.

Russia knows B-29's from available bases could plow up Soviet industries as effectively as we did in Japan and Germany—and without the atomic bomb. Russia knows that we could scrap every B-29 and start from scratch and still destroy Russia through the air within two years from tonight. Our industry is and always will be our head start.

But I believe that there probably will be no great world war for more than ten years because we will not start it. Russia will not start it, and nobody else is big

enough. That does not mean that there will not be little wars. We've got plenty of those right now, and therein lies a double danger. First, the danger that America and Russia will use little wars like the present mess in China the same way the Axis and Russia used Spain—fighting in somebody else's house to line up the teams for the big game. The second danger in all these little wars is that they will keep America and Russia so jumpy that the time may never come when we can trust each other enough to strip-tease ourselves of our multiple girdles of sovereignty.

A number of sincere leaders say that now is the time to shed sovereignty and plunk all our faith in a world government. I don't think Britain is ready for it, nor is Russia, nor China, nor France, *nor* America.

We can't even get General Motors and the United Auto Workers to surrender enough of their sovereignty to arbitrate their strike. We can't get the Navy to surrender enough of its sovereignty to achieve unification of national defense. Maybe Americans no longer have guns on their shoulders, but we still have chips on our shoulders—and so does the rest of the world.

Since I left America three years ago, I've seen sovereign Irishmen grow more stubborn than ever. Englishmen first learned to respect and finally to resent Americans. I've seen Frenchmen shoot at Frenchmen and Italians at Italians; Greeks shoot at Englishmen and each other; Yugoslavs shoot at each

other; and I've been shot at and captured by Russians who thought mine was one of the American planes that had accidentally strafed and killed a Russian general.

I've seen Chinese shoot at Chinese. In Bangkok, I ate a Chinese dinner under a table because Chinese were shooting at Siamese. In Saigon, I watched Indian troops, and Japanese troops, and Vichy French troops under the command—all of them—of an English major firing at Annamites who had just killed an American colonel.

In Java, the Indonesians decorated buildings with the slogans of America's fight for independence. But when the British ran up the Dutch flag in Batavia, they flew the British flag on one side and the American flag on the other to show the Indonesians that America's Declaration of Independence cannot be translated into brown languages.

Nowhere in any nation from Ireland to England, the long way 'round, have I found a depth of understanding that is an essential prelude to effective world government.

That doesn't mean we should not work to get what is not now possible, and, as a very brief preliminary prescription, I suggest first this precaution: keep an Air Force based in Alaska than can smash any potential enemy in 48 hours—with or without atomic bombs; and then, let the world know exactly what we will fight for—how much provocation and where; and then send at least 100,000 young Americans each year to

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT—One of the best known among military analysts either on the air or in the press is George Fielding Eliot. Major Eliot was born in Brooklyn, New York, in 1894. After his graduation from Melbourne University in Australia, he served with the Australian Imperial Force from 1914 to 1918. From 1922 until 1930 he served as a captain and later as a major in the Military Intelligence Reserve of the United States Army. After five years as an accountant in Kansas City, Missouri, Major Eliot began writing for fiction magazines in 1926. Since 1928 he has written especially on military and international affairs and on military defense. At present he is military analyst for the *New York Herald Tribune* and is heard regularly on the radio.

Major Eliot's books include *If War Comes*, *The Ramparts We Watch*, *Bombs Bursting in Air*, and *Hour of Triumph*.

RAYMOND SWING — News analyst and commentator Raymond Swing, was born in Cortlandt, New York, in 1887. He attended Oberlin College and Conservatory of Music and has degrees from Oberlin, Olivet, Williams, Muhlenberg, Lafayette, and Harvard. Mr. Swing began a newspaper career in Cleveland and later worked on papers in Orrville, Ohio; Richmond, Indiana; Indianapolis, Indiana, and Cincinnati, Ohio. From 1913 to 1917, he was Berlin correspondent for the *Chicago Daily News*. In 1918, he became an examiner for the War Labor Board but returned to Germany in 1919 to become Berlin correspondent for the *New York Herald*. The foreign service of the *Wall Street Journal* engaged him time from 1922 to 1924. Then he became

London correspondent for the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* and the *New York Evening Post*, a position he held until 1934.

From 1934 to 1936, Mr. Swing was a member of the board of editors of *The Nation*. Then he reversed his usual procedure and became New York correspondent for the *London News Chronicle*. In 1935 he became a news commentator on American affairs for the British Broadcasting System, and on foreign affairs for the American School of the Air. For several years he was commentator on foreign affairs for the Mutual Broadcasting System and since 1942 has been with the Blue (now American Broadcasting Company) Network.

Mr. Swing is the author of *Forerunners of American Fascism*, *How War Came*, and *Preview of History*. He is also a contributor to both English and American magazines.

CORD MEYER—Lt. Cord Meyer, Jr., now in his twenty-fifth year, a graduate of St. Paul's and of Yale, Class of 1943, distinguished himself as the leader of a machine-gun platoon in the 22nd Marine Regiment during our capture of Eniwetok and Guam. He was decorated with the Bronze Star. At the San Francisco Conference he was one of the two aides to Commander Stassen. Lt. Meyer is the author of articles appearing in recent issues of *Atlantic Monthly*.

JOHN REAGAN (TEX) McCRARY—Lt. Col. "Tex" McCrary, former chief editorial writer for the *New York Daily Mirror*, served in the Mediterranean Air Forces. He was former Public Relations Officer for the 8th Army Air Force.

study in foreign countries—and more than half of them to Russia. Draft them if you have to, but send them, and on an even-swap basis if possible.

And finally, turn the cables and message center of our State Department over to the Associated Press so that the machinery of our foreign policy can run in the daylight for a change. (*Applause.*)

This prescription adds up to cautious growth, through a slowly toughened United Nations organi-

zation, and eventually to world government—but not now. If you try to hitch a wagon to a wild horse before he's broken to harness, you wind up by breaking the wagon and making the horse wilder than ever. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Tex McCrary. Now, we will have a little sparring here with the speakers up here in the ring. Gentlemen, will you join me up here around the microphone while we continue our discussion before

we let this representative New York audience in on this discussion?

Mr. Swing: have you a question for the speakers? No, no, that comes later. There is something up here.

Mr. Swing: Well, I've got to say to Col. McCrary that when he speaks of the sovereignty—General Motors and the CIO not giving up their sovereignty—does he believe they're fighting with bombs and airplanes, heavy artillery and weapons of war, or have they given up some of their sovereignty? Isn't that just what we want in the world—that kind of sovereignty given up? (*Applause.*)

Col. McCrary: I think that the UAW and the General Motors are fighting with everything they've got, which is exactly the way the nations of the world are now prepared to fight, which is the reason why I think we've got to grow up as nations exactly like the Unions and Management have got to grow up as citizens of this Nation. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Swing: In pursuing the matter of the willingness to give up sovereignty, you made the statement that the English are not ready to give it up, although last week one of the leaders of the Conservative party, Mr. Anthony Eden, stated that he wanted a world which was governed in the way that Scotland, Wales, and England were governed.

And then Mr. Bevin, as the Foreign Secretary, came out with one of the most extraordinary statements in favor of the limita-

tion of sovereignty based upon popular will. That is like Secretary Byrnes saying it in this country and, let us say, Governor Dewey. I believe that the people in England are just as ready for world government as anyone who can understand it.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Major Eliot, will you latch on to that, please?

Major Eliot: I'd just like to remind Mr. Swing that Mr. Eden's party is very decidedly in the minority, and that Mr. Bevin, before making his statement, very carefully made it clear to the House of Commons that he was not speaking with the responsibility of the Cabinet, but was giving only his own personal view as to what might sometime be desirable.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Meyer?

Mr. Meyer: Yes? I was interested in your travelogue, Col. McCrary, but I don't think it bore on the point. You say that we are safe from another war for 15 years, but I'd like to quote to you just a few words from a man who knows — Dr. Langmuir, Nobel Prize winner, atomic expert, chief scientist for General Electric.

Here is his quote: "If Russia went all out on it, she would have atomic bombs in two years. In one year more she could have atomic bombs to destroy all our cities." Thank you, and I wish you'd answer that question.

Mr. Denny: Col. McCrary.

Col. McCrary: I don't like to match experts up here nor travelogues, but I'll stick to Hap Arnold and General Spaatz and Jimmie

Doolittle and men like that who have to deliver the bombs after they're brought to the test-tube point, and I think they think we're Okay for about 10 or 15 years. Incidentally the travelogue was cited to establish the reasons for my what you might call pessimism, so that you wouldn't confuse it with indigestion. (*Laughter.*) I just think that during this breathing time, we'd better learn to get along a little better rather than try to force this thing all down at once.

Mr. Denny: All right. Mr. Meyer.

Mr. Meyer: I'd just like to make the point that it's very unlikely that we shall get along together while each nation is striving to build up more atomic bombs than the others. The only way to get along together is to eliminate the threat implicit in atomic attack. Thank you. (*Applause.*)

Major Eliot: I still don't quite understand why Mr. Meyer cannot see just what is being done in that respect through the United Nations Organization. Just the other day the President of the United States and the Prime Ministers of Great Britain and Canada, who are the only nations now who have any atomic bombs or any access to atomic bombs, proposed to abolish atomic weapons altogether; proposed that every nation, including our own, should agree never to use atomic bombs again; and proposed that propositions to this effect should be entertained by the United Nations Organization at

the first meeting of its General Assembly.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Swing, perhaps you can come in there.

Mr. Swing: I want to come in on this question of the United Nations Organization. Major Eliot said that we were calling the Charter inadequate before it was even started. But the Charter was written at the time the bomb was being tried out, and we don't think that the time that is left in which to make the Charter effective is sufficient.

And as to the outlawing of the bomb, I remind Major Eliot that all the nations of the world, including Germany, signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact in which the use of war as a means of national policy was outlawed. We are for an organization of the world with the power, with the force, which can enforce these outlawing decisions. That power does not rest now with the United Nations Organization. (*Applause.*)

Major Eliot: In other words, Mr. Swing is for appointing somebody to take care of the world. But I just don't quite see how we're going to appoint this authority, or who he's going to be or what constraint we're going to put upon him to see that he does his job. In other words, as a Latin poet used to say, who is going to watch these guardians.

Mr. Denny: All right. Mr. Meyer?

Mr. Meyer: I'd like to answer that question directly. We don't envision appointing anybody. We envision electing people, and the

people who are going to watch them are the people of the world. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you.

Major Eliot: And who is going to participate in these elections? About three-quarters of the peoples of the world have never participated in a free election in their lives.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Meyer, go ahead.

Mr. Meyer: Just to make one point and that is that the people in Dutch colonial possessions seem only too eager to participate in elections. (*Applause.*)

Major Eliot: That is not the point. They haven't.

Mr. Denny: All right, Mr. McCrary. One observation and then we've got to let the audience in on this.

Col. McCrary: You can bet they

would. You might ask Mr. Bevin why he won't let them.

Mr. Denny: You can answer that in the question period, but this is the time we have to pause briefly for station identification. (*Laughter.*)

Announcer: You are listening to America's Town Meeting, sponsored by *The Reader's Digest*, America's favorite magazine. Tonight, Commentators Raymond Swing and George Fielding Eliot and Veterans Reagan "Tex" McCrary and Cord Meyer are discussing the vital question, "Does the Atomic Bomb Make World Government Essential Now?"

For a complete copy of this discussion, including the question period immediately following, send for the Town Meeting Bulletin. Write to Town Hall, New York 18, New York. Enclose 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE I

Mr. Denny: Thank you, and now we start with the lady with the chartreuse blouse. That's chartreuse, isn't it?

Lady: Mr. Swing. I agree with those who believe in the importance of establishing a world government as soon as possible. Do you think, with political discords among nations as they exist today, it is possible to form a satisfactorily working world organization in a comparatively short space of time, and why?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Swing. That's what he was trying to say for five minutes, but go ahead. Care to amplify that?

Mr. Swing: I believe that one of the reasons for the discord in the world today is fear. And one of the reasons for fear is that nations know that they are going to be subject to attack from other nations. If we have an organization in which there will not be attack, then I believe that fear will vanish or diminish, and people,

themselves, will change. I believe that when this change has been made, we can make a world government so much more quickly than we make peace under present conditions that we'll all be surprised. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman on the aisle.

Man: Colonel McCrary. Will isolationist thinking and its expression in public help to get the nations ready for world government within the 15 years you mentioned, Colonel McCrary? (*Applause.*)

Colonel McCrary: I don't work for the *Mirror* any more. (*Laughter and applause.*) However, just a minute, Doctor. I think that we're not going to get this world government until the *Daily Mirror* can be published in Moscow. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady back here. All right, go ahead.

Lady: I'd like to ask Major Eliot why he has such implicit faith in the Charter of the United Nations Organization when the five big powers have the veto power, and, as far as preventing war is concerned, it's actually useless.

Mr. Denny: Major Eliot.

Major Eliot: I don't figure anything I said should have given you the idea that I have implicit faith in the United Nations Organization. What I said was that it was the best that the representatives of 51 nations assembled at San Francisco could work out. It was the best that they could agree upon as a beginning, as a start in the direc-

tion toward which all the delegates there present wanted to go—the security of the world. It is the organization we have. It is the organization to which our government and fifty other governments, after due and careful consideration, are now pledged. It is quite possible to find fault with it, but it is not possible to deny the fact that it was the best that those delegates could work out, and they took a long time to do it, and I was there and watched them. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young man in brown.

Man: Mr. Meyer. In this world government, would you accept the colonial peoples, the so-called backward peoples of the world—and I include India and the Dutch East Indies, specifically—as equals under that government?

Mr. Meyer: I think that a representative system had to be worked out on a basis of weighted representation. I think that all people in the world should directly elect their representatives to the legislative assembly that I speak of. But I do think that some other factors have to be taken into consideration, such as industrial potential, natural resources, etc. And I think that on that basis we can work out a workable legislative assembly. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The man in the balcony in the gray suit. Yes.

Man: I'd like to ask Major Eliot as a military expert. I am only a layman. Neither one of us knew anything at all about the

atomic bomb. Neither one of us now knows definitely whether Russia, Britain, or Indonesia, or any place or anyone has any knowledge of the atomic bomb. Do you?

Major Eliot: Are you asking me whether any other nation has any knowledge of the atomic bomb?

Man: That's right.

Major Eliot: It's a matter of general scientific knowledge that the basic principles of atomic fission were being worked on by the scientists of all countries quite a long while before this war. The Germans, in particular, had made considerable advances in that respect. But the scientists of other nations were working about them, and you found articles about atomic fission and its possibilities in the scientific journals of the whole world. As to the actual possession, the manufacture of atomic weapons, however, those have only been manufactured in the United States, and the only nations other than the United States which have present knowledge of them because this was worked out in the war are the United Kingdom and Canada.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman here.

Man: To Raymond Gram Swing. The atomic bomb is fearful. In my opinion, a secretary of peace in each nation could prevent its destructive use and educate the people to use it constructively. What do you think?

Mr. Denny: Is that a question?

Man: Yes.

Mr. Denny: Of course. Yes. All right. Is that a question? What do you think?

Mr. Swing: What do I think? (*Laughter.*) I don't think a cabinet minister all by himself is enough to establish peace. I think we have to organize society on the basis of law, and that we have to enforce that law, and we have to subordinate our sovereignties to that law. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady in the balcony.

Lady: Mr. Denny has instructed us to be relentless in our questions of how and why. My question of how is directed to Major Eliot. How, Major Eliot, have you arrived at the conclusion that the world is not yet ready for world government? (*Applause.*)

Major Eliot: Very, very largely by reading the newspapers which are a very valuable source of information. (*Laughter.*)

There are quite a number of different approaches to the problem of government in various parts of the world. There are, as I pointed out to Mr. Meyer a few moments ago, well over half the population of the world who have never participated in a free election, although it is proposed that the delegates to this world authority be freely elected, presumably by the democratic process which is not accepted by great powers, and in which many people have no experience and no means of making it work.

It is quite clear, as Beardsley Rumml once put it and as I said in my speech, that the moral and psychological sense of world community does not exist among the peoples of the world. It exists

among a few people here, doubtless among many of your friends with whom you talk, but it does not exist throughout the whole world. Go out to Kansas and see how much you find of it.

Mr. Denny: Anybody here from Kansas? There's a man from Korea here in the box somewhere. Has he an observation to make at this time? The gentleman from Korea? Yes? I didn't get his name but I know he's here. There he is.

Man: Dr. Shinn, Korean-American consul.

Mr. Denny: Thank you so much, Dr. Shinn. We are glad to have you.

Dr. Shinn: I would like to ask the four gentlemen, all.

Mr. Denny: We'll take them one at a time.

Dr. Shinn: Anyone will be Okay. Today there is so much talk about giving the atom bomb to this country or that country, and certain countries are demanding atom bomb knowledge. Why do we not talk about some of the responsibilities that go with the atom bomb?

Mr. Denny: Mr. McCrary, would you speak to that, about the responsibilities of owning the atom bomb?

Col. McCrary: Doctor, your question is going to be a ricochet. I'm going to pass it on to the audience. I'd say that one of the responsibilities of owning the atom bomb is being some day on the verge of discovering the secret of atomic energy, which means that one morning we might wake up

and find out that one man with a handful of something can run all the power in the country and nobody will have to work. That is a real threat.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. McCrary. Mr. Meyer, have you an observation on that?

Mr. Meyer: Our position, that of Mr. Swing and myself, would say that so long as the present condition of the world is anarchy, in which each nation can and will use any weapon at its disposal when war starts, we should not give the atomic bomb to any of the nations. We agree with Mr. Einstein that we must first set up an adequate world government, and then when it is set up, then and when it is capable of using atomic energy to the right purposes, then let's give it to them. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The man over there.

Man: Don't you think that the idea of a world government-international police force can be conveyed by telling people to read *The Reader's Digest* and Emery Reves' new book, "The Anatomy of Peace"? That will solve the problem and this will be the last war.

Mr. Denny: Well now, the gentleman has brought up a book by a very distinguished gentleman who's down here on the front row. I'm very happy to see him. He's the author of an extremely important book that is being widely discussed, and I think it is on the best seller list—"The Anatomy of Peace," by Emery Reves. Mr. Reves, have you a question at this

time? How about a question for one of these speakers?

Mr. Reves: I came here to learn and not to talk.

Mr. Denny: You came here to learn and not to talk? All right, we'll take the question from the gentleman here. Yes?

Man: My question is addressed to Mr. Eliot. Don't you believe that if the peoples of the entire world were guaranteed a certain bill of rights we would not even need a world government—that the people themselves would decide to outlaw war?

Mr. Denny: Major Eliot.

Major Eliot: I should like very much to see the peoples of the entire world guaranteed human rights as I understand human rights. I'm not sure whether everyone in the world understands human rights as I have been brought up in this country to understand them. But there are certain basic human rights which ought to be guaranteed, which we are trying in this country to apply to everybody, which we haven't altogether guaranteed even in this country to all our citizens, as yet, as is well known, and which are also being guaranteed more or less imperfectly in other countries, to a greater or less degree, and in accordance with what they think are the important human rights. In some countries, economic rights are considered more important than political, and so it goes. It is a problem of infinite complexity.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over there.

Man: Mr. Swing, you said that world government is essential now.

By what method and application could you say that world government is essential now? The peoples are not ready yet to organize, nor have you got a preliminary organization existing today to at least start that organization, which will take quite a long time.

Mr. Swing: That's the question that some of the speakers before us have raised—whether or not the world can introduce world government quickly. It can introduce it just as quickly as we can understand it. I think that we must remember that the atomic bomb was dropped for the first time in history only last July, and I think we're doing pretty well to come to an understanding of it in this country. We have come very far along when Mr. Bevin and Mr. Eden both come out for world government in England, and within a few months more, you will find that the understanding of the problem of world government will spread all over the world.

It took us quite a while to get our United States of America after the Confederation—after the Revolutionary War was won. As we look back on it in history, it was very quick work, and I think we will be able to get the world government just as quickly as modern communications and modern intelligence can spread over the world. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Swing. The naval officer there.

Man: My question is for Mr. Meyer. We all agree that any world government should be a democratic world government, and

I think we all agree that that's the only kind of world government that can work. Is there any reason to believe that a world which is largely composed of undemocratic nations can form a democratic world government? Will the representatives, legally accredited of autocracies and dictatorships, instruct their representatives to vote democratically in such a government?

Mr. Meyer: That's a very good question, and I think the answer to it is that the very threat that is in the world today from the fear of war and the fear of atomic warfare and the kind of warfare that preceded that, that that threat is one of the main reasons for the existence of dictatorships, that countries, in order to protect themselves, have often been forced to rely upon a centralized authority to give them the strength that they believe might be necessary for their defense. And I believe when we take out of this picture the threat of atomic warfare and the disaster inherent in it, we may have some chance, and a real chance, of reaching genuine democracy in the world.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Meyer. The gentleman there.

Man: My question is for Mr. Eliot; in fact, three closely related questions.

Mr. Denny: You've got exactly thirty seconds. What are you going to do with them?

Man: Do you believe that with the history of the Siegfried Line behind you, that you can have security with a line of airplanes in

Alaska; that these airplanes will know where to hit an enemy country; and why airplanes are not yet out of date?

Major Eliot: Well, I think if you are asking me, does the history of the Siegfried Line have anything to do with air warfare, the answer is no, it does not. Lines of fortifications have never been a satisfactory defense, and when anyone has ever tried to build them and depend upon them, they have always proved a failure. On the other hand, offensive power—the ability to strike back—is the basis of security today.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Major Eliot. Now we are going to hear from Major Eliot and Mr. Swing in just a moment when they give us their summaries of this evening's discussion. In the meantime, Fred B. Cole has a message for you from *The Reader's Digest*.

Announcer: Tonight, *The Reader's Digest* brings to a close 15 months of association with America's Town Meeting as sponsor of a program that is doing perhaps more than any other to stimulate awareness of pressing public problems among the people of the country. In concluding its sponsorship, *The Reader's Digest* wishes to express its very personal appreciation of the great work for democracy that is being carried out by America's Town Meeting and George V. Denny, Jr.

We are proud that in the 15 months just past, the listening audience to this program has more than doubled and are confident that this growth will be continued.

In the years to come, we shall watch with affection and confidence, not as sponsors but as loyal friends, the growth of a program which goes far toward symbolizing a spirit of American democracy. Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Fred Cole. I want to express our sincere appreciation to our sponsor, *The Reader's Digest*, and to all of the individuals and corporations and groups who have done so much during the past 15 months to advance the cause of and increase the audience for America's Town Meeting.

Not once during that period were our sponsors and their associates unmindful of the fact that this was your Town Meeting, that they were sharing with us the sense of trusteeship for a program that has become, during the past ten years, a national institution. We take leave of this association with genuine regret, and I hope that our association with any new sponsor will be as mutually advantageous.

In the meantime, the American Broadcasting Company and most of its affiliated stations will continue to bring you this program, produced as usual by our staff here at Town Hall, and we will continue to welcome your suggestions, criticisms, and support.

And now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, we hear first from Major Eliot. Major Eliot for the negative.

Major Eliot: I think that Col. McCrary's position and mine may

be summed up very briefly. We do not believe that a world government—and remember we're talking about government now and not an association of nations nor a United Nations Organization as it now exists—is not possible. We do not believe that the nations of this world are prepared to give sufficient powers to any world government to enable it to deal directly with their citizens as the Federal Government of the United States can deal with citizens of the various states of this Union. Anything short of that is not a government.

There seems to be no indication whatever that nations are prepared to do that now. But we do fear, and fear very much, that the United Nations Organization which exists, to which the faith and honor of this government are pledged and the faith and honor of 50 other governments throughout the world, will be brought into discredit and disrepute by these constant attacks, by these constant cries that it is inadequate to do the tasks for which it was designed and for which the delegates of all these nations meeting at San Francisco only last spring designed it as carefully as they could and after painstaking work for many weeks and months. We want to see the United Nations Organization work. We want to see it made better. But we want to see people have some faith in it and try to make it do the task and bear the great responsibility that was given to it at San Francisco.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Maj. Eliot. And now Mr. Swing for the affirmative.

Mr. Swing: We're not attacking the United Nations Organization. It is not an attack on an organization to wish to make it better. And Mr. Meyer and I are fortunate in our opponents tonight, for they've shown that they really are on our side. They've not argued against world government—what they've argued is that the world is not yet ready for it, and that was not the subject of the debate. An automobile stalled on the railroad track may be unable to move, but that doesn't make it any the less essential that it should be moved. We are not debating whether civilization is stalled on the railroad track. We're debating whether it's essential for it to move.

We, on our side, challenge the assertion that the world is not ready for world government. Major Eliot, Col. McCrary, Mr. Meyer, and I are all ready for it. Why this assumption that we are some kind of superior beings and all other folks of the world are confirmed nitwits? Give them the chance to understand the choice between peace and destruction. Come along, Major Eliot and Colonel McCrary, help us give them the facts.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Raymond Swing, Major Eliot, Lt. Meyer, and Col. McCrary for your outstanding contribution to a terribly important question.

Now, next week we turn to a topic that you have insisted we discuss again and again—and we are glad to do so—"Do We Need Universal Military Training Now?"

Our speakers will be Frank Miles, a veteran of World War I and II, war correspondent of the National War Veterans publication, and Lt. Gen. Raymond S. McClain, Commanding General of the 19th Corps, who say yes. Senator Edwin C. Johnson, Democrat of Colorado, and member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and Charles Guy Bolte, Chairman of the American Veterans Committee, who say no.

The following week, December 13, our question will be, "Can We Have Higher Wages Without Higher Prices?" Our speakers will be Chester Bowles, Director of the Office of Price Administration; Congressman Chase Going Woodhouse, Democrat of Connecticut; Senator Kenneth S. Wherry, Republican of Nebraska; and Henry Pope, Jr., President of the Bear Brand Hosiery Company. So listen next week and every week for the sound of the crier's bell.

TOWN MEETING PREVIEW

Can We Have Higher Wages Without Higher Prices?

By CHARLES E. MARTZ

The subject outlined in this preview is to our best knowledge the one which will be used on America's Town Meeting of the Air, Thursday evening, December 13, 1945. However, in view of the rapidity of developments, there is always a possibility that another topic which seems more urgent may be substituted.

In his message on labor problems, President Truman stated that most industry can today grant a wage increase as high as 24 per cent without raising prices. Automobile Workers' Reuther has submitted a long statistical brief purporting to show that General Motors can well afford to pay a 30 per cent wage increase without raising prices. It is of the utmost importance that the American people give these statements careful and critical attention, for public opinion will probably be the deciding factor in the long run.

Our American system of private enterprise is based upon the assumption that there must be a fair rate of return on invested capital. Therein lies the first question to be discussed on this program. What is a fair rate of return on capital? Obviously the rate will not be the same for well established concerns as for new ventures where there is a great risk involved.

Some economists point out that production is brought about by many factors—labor and capital being two of them—and that the price of each has tended to obey the law of supply and demand. At present there is a great reser-

voir of capital ready for investment. The obvious result, if natural law is to prevail, is that the cost of capital should go down. If this is a valid point, it may have some bearing upon the question of a fair return on capital.

A second question concerns the base upon which our calculations shall be made—for our question is obviously one of arithmetic. Are we to decide production costs on the basis of the next few months, when mass production will not have made much headway and when unit costs will be higher, or are we justified in looking forward for six months or a year to the time when the assembly lines will be going full blast and unit costs will be down? If we adopt the latter viewpoint, are we justified in concluding that industry should pay any immediate losses which would result from current wage increases out of surpluses due to high profits of war production?

A third fundamental question has to do with the facts with which we have to deal. On one side is the labor statement that industry can afford to pay higher wages. On the other is industry's statement that higher wages are

impossible unless the public absorbs the increased cost by paying higher prices. Upon what facts are we to draw our conclusions? Which view is correct?

Industry has insisted that its books not be opened to investigators from the unions, the Government, or a board of arbitration. What industry does with its net income is, from this point of view, industry's own business. Any interference with that freedom would be a violation of the principles of free enterprise. The other side insists that corporation profits which touch the public interest are of public concern, and that it is necessary for all to know the facts in order to draw conclusions as to how much of the profits might better have been paid out in wages.

The question arises, then, as to the extent to which the financing policies of great corporations should be subjected to review by the public.

After these fundamentals have been dealt with, we probably will consider many more practical questions. What relation is there between this question and the pres-

ent dammed-up demand for goods? May we conclude that the demand will be so great for some time that a smaller profit per unit will be to the best interest of all?

And then there is the whole matter of consumption. Production is important, but there is no possibility of increased production unless all the goods produced are consumed, and that means purchasing power in the hands of millions of people. Is it possible that higher wages, with a smaller net profit would be most profitable from the long-range point of view?

It is obvious that increased wages either must be paid out of greater income or out of what would be net profit. In a business which has not sufficient net profit to meet new wage demands, the question is easy to answer. Either higher wages will result in increased production with attendant increased income, or the increase in wages cannot be granted. Where the question is one of the size and disposition of a healthy net income, we are driven back to the fundamental questions suggested early in this Preview.